REMARKS

New claim 8 has been added. Claims 1, 3-4, and 6-8 are pending in the application.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,225,981 (Yokogawa).

Yokogawa is directed to a language analyzer including a dictionary having dictionary data including morpheme data for words. According to Yokogawa, the language analyzer further includes a parsing analyzer for conducting morphological analysis for an inputted sentence by referring to the dictionary. The morphological analysis section parses the morphemes of an English sentence while dividing them by retrieving a word dictionary. After being subjected to parsing, the English data are transferred to a structure transformation section. The structure transformation section prepares a corresponding Japanese structure tree from the intermediate English structure and transforms the Japanese structure tree into a Japanese-underlying structure from which a Japanese sentence can be translated. *See* Yokogawa, column 51, lines 10-20 and lines 38-45.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4, and 7 are patentable over Yokogawa, as Yokogawa does not teach, "replacing means for generating a pattern of a predetermined translated sentence *corresponding* to the *string of the conceptual categories* to replace the pattern of the predetermined translated sentence with translated words corresponding to the original morphemes of the conceptual categories constituting the patterns of the translated sentence. . .," as recited in claim 1, for example [emphasis added].

In Yokogawa, assuming *arguendo* (for the purpose of argument) that the Japanese Underlying Structure replaces the Japanese Structure Tree, the Japanese Underlying Structure is not a pattern of a predetermined translated sentence that corresponds to a string of conceptual categories. Yokogawa clearly states that the syntactic analysis section simply parses surface layer structure for a sentence while applying grammatical rules to English data, that is, parses morpheme data, which results in an intermediate English Tree, from which a Japanese Structure Tree is prepared, which results in a Japanese Underlying Structure being prepared. *See* Yokogawa, column 51, lines 24-45.

Therefore, the Japanese Underlying Structure is simply a Japanese Tree that shows the underlying structure with respect to the morphemes which were represented in the intermediate English Structure Tree and the Japanese Structure Tree, and is not a pattern of a predetermined translated sentence that "*corresponds to a string of conceptual categories.*"

Moreover, although Yokogawa discloses a dictionary including dictionary data, unlike the vocabulary information file in the present invention, Yokogawa's dictionary simply includes morpheme data for words and phrases, and does not define a relationship between conceptual categories and morphemes, as in the present invention.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 4, and 7 are patentable over Yokogawa. As dependent claims 3 and 6 depend from independent claims 1 and 4, respectively, the dependent claims are patentable over Yokogawa for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

Claims 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokogawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,895,446 (Takeda).

As previously explained, Yokogawa does not teach, "replacing means for generating a pattern of a predetermined translated sentence *corresponding* to the *string of the conceptual categories* to replace the pattern of the predetermined translated sentence with translated words corresponding to the original morphemes of the conceptual categories constituting the patterns of the translated sentence. . .," as recited in claim 1. Yokogawa also does not suggest the feature, as Yokogawa is simply concerned with translation based on parsing morphemes.

Takeda also does not teach the above-identified feature. In contrast to the present invention, Takeda translates by applying various parts of a target language text to a translation pattern. *See* Takeda, column 2, lines 27-46.

Therefore, claims 3 and 6, via independent claims 1 and 4, respectively, are patentable over the references, as neither Yokogawa nor Takeda, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of the claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is patentable over the references, as neither of the references, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests:

> converting morphemes to a string of conceptual categories;
> and
> generating a translated sentence corresponding to the string of the conceptual categories;
> wherein said converting includes dividing the morphemes and comparing the divided morphemes against a vocabulary information file formed of a specific library to extract the divided morphemes as conceptual categories and extracting a conceptual category defined by a definition included within the information file when a target morpheme satisfies a condition of each definition included within the vocabulary information file

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3-15-06

By: _____
Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501